THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." St. Luke, 2. 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1823. NO. 7.

ON CHRISTIAN SOCIETY BY *R. WRIGHT.*

Many steady believers, who are regular in their attendance on public worship, and unexceptionable in their moral conduct, neglect to unite themselves with any christian society. How is this to be reconciled with a strict and impartial regard to all the precepts and precedents contained in the New-Testament? It is conceived that such persons deprive themselves of much spiritual benefit, and the church of the advantages which might be derived from their assistance and exertions in the common cause, were they to become members of christian societies.

Man is evidently formed for society; so far as he detaches himself and walks alone, his mind will be apt to contract, his views to be narrowed, his affections to become lifeless, and all his mental powers to become inert; for it is amid the free intercourses of society the mind dilates, the views are enlarged, the affections enlivened, and all the powers stimulated to activity. However useful solitude and meditation may be, they furnish not those sources of improvement and happiness, which are to be found in society.—To retire and converse with our own hearts will frequently be both necessary and useful; but it will be most useful to the man who participates in all the intercourses of a christian brotherhood. It is only in society that all the feelings of the mind can have vent, that individuals can give and receive information, and that those social pleasures can be experienced which give a relish to every thing in life. God hath given all the social feelings to man, and in the course of his providence placed him in the social state, for the alleviation of "the ills which flesh is heir to,"—for the eliciting of thoughts and ideas—for the generation of mind—for the production of rational enjoyment—and for the gradual improvement of the individual, and of the species. Brooding over his own thoughts, in solitude, when assailed by the shafts of adversity, or laboring under gloom and despondency, man would become wretched in the extreme; but let the voice of friendship salute his ear, let the endearments of society engage his attention—give him an opportunity of venting his sorrows to those who can sympathize with him—the sadness of his mind is relieved, through all the gloom a sun beam cheers his sickening soul. In all the fulness of enjoyment, if restrained from expressing his feelings to those who are capable of participating in them, man's pleasures would soon wither, and his enjoyments lose half their value. So evident is it that many advantages are derived from the social state, which could not be enjoyed in solitude and seclusion; but most of all may those advantages be expected in a society founded and conducted upon the liberal principles of the gospel.

Christianity never was designed to destroy the passions, or to abate any of the social feelings; on the contrary, it is intended to purify and elevate the former, and give intenseness to the latter in every virtuous direction: by which means it maturates every social virtue. It has not the least tendency to counteract the laws of nature, either in the physical or in the moral world: it is indeed intended and adapted to remedy the disorders which sin has introduced—to remove ignorance and its consequences—to lead man to the highest state of moral excellence; but it is intended to effect these important ends by operating upon us according to that constitution of nature which our Creator has given us, and those principles which arise from our organization as rational and social beings.

That gloomy superstition which insulated man from his species, which extinguished the best feelings of the human heart, which taught him to sacrifice the endearments of society for a superstitious solitude, and to substitute mummery in the place of rational piety and virtue, was not less dishonorable to God than injurious to man; not less alien to genuine christianity than repugnant to reason, sound philosophy, and the established laws of human nature. The apostles and primitive christians never supposed that they could serve God by retiring from the world to live in the solitude of deserts; they thought it their duty to unite and walk together in the spirit of their great Master, in the midst of men, that they might enlighten and bless mankind; it entered not into their minds that mummery could be devotion, or that God could be glorified by their despi

sing the gifts of his providence, or by a voluntary renunciation of those rational and virtuous enjoyments of which he had formed them capable; what they professed was reasonable, their piety manly, and their whole conduct such as sound philosophy must approve. It was not till christianity was corrupted that anchorets arose and monachism obtained footing among the professors of the gospel.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE HERALD.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

As the plain language of Truth is ever more cogent and convincing than sophistry and finesse; I humbly beg the privilege of making a few brief, plain remarks on the fashionable doctrine of "*Total depravity.*" Were not this doctrine so often reiterated from the "sacred desk," and swallowed, with avidity, by the ignorant and credulous part of community, who are taught that it is a *sin* to *disbelieve* what their *Minister* says, and a *duty* to *believe* what they *cannot understand*, no pains or labor would now be requisite to disprove a doctrine, so inconsistent and unscriptural. But, believing it to be a fundamental error, industriously propagated; and influenced by a desire to advance the cause of religion and truth, it is deemed necessary to expose its absurdity, and show its deformity: For "to open the eyes of the blind," and chase away the dark mists of error and delusion from the mental horizon; and disseminate the glorious principle of the Gospel of peace in all its primitive purity, are imperious duties incumbent on all friends to the prosperity of Zion, and the peace and happiness of the world. Come then, brethren, "let us reason together," and see "whether these things be so." We are told that "mankind by nature are totally depraved," consequently, wholly incapable of doing one good action—saying one good word, or thinking one good thought—and that "man of himself, *can do nothing*:" And yet, it is said if he does not "work out his own salvation" he will be damned—*eternally damned!* If this be a fact, O, miserable, gloomy, wretched condition of man! Then farewell hope, a long farewell to every prospect of future felicity. His situation is truly "dark—dark, irrecoverably dark." Well might he exclaim, in the language of despair, "What *can* I do to be saved?

But let us examine the subject, and compare the language of Scripture with that of error. It is said that children are born into the world totally depraved, and remain so until, in riper years, they experience the renovating influence of the holy spirit—But what does Christ say? "Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me; for of *such* is the *kingdom of heaven*." Mat. 19. 14. Quere. Is the *kingdom of heaven* peopled with creatures *totally depraved?* Scripture saith, "Without holiness shall no man see the Lord." Now if "children are born into the world totally depraved," why did our Saviour represent them as emblems of innocence and purity? See Mat. 18. 3. "Except ye be converted and become as *little children* ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Again, it is said that we are by nature wholly depraved, and nothing but the *irresistible* power of the Holy Spirit operating upon the human heart can change us; but, it is also said that we often resist and grieve away the Spirit, and probably in the same discourse, after laboring to prove mankind totally depraved, we are exhorted and commanded to create to ourselves a *new* and a *clean* heart! Quere. How can any thing *clean* or *pure* proceed from *total depravity?* or how can the creature *resist* that which is *irresistible?* What marvellous consistency! As well may that which is *finite* overpower *infinity*, or *darkness* produce *light*. But admitting for a moment this doctrine to be true, and that some are, in this life, radically and totally changed in their nature; I would then ask the advocates for this doctrine, how it would be possible, after experiencing this mysterious change to do a *bad* action, or possess one evil propensity; for surely if man *before* experiencing this change cannot *do*, *say*, or think any thing *right*; by a parity of reasoning, he cannot *after* this radical change, *do*, *say*, or think any thing *wrong*, nor can one evil propensity or sinful passion dwell in his heart: And instead of the subjects of this change being long in *doubt* whether they had experienced it or not, it would be as apparent as the mid-day sun—Yes the difference in their situations and lives would be as great, and as easily distinguished as day and night.—But this wide difference does not exist among the people of this world. Again—admitting mankind are totally depraved, a question will naturally arise, how came they so? Will it be said that we are all plunged into the dreary gulf of *total depravity* by the transgression and fall of Adam, who was created upright and holy? Reader how can this be? Can a *finite* being change his *nature* by an act of his own? or make that *mortal* and *depraved* which God made *immortal* and *holy?* I know it is a popular idea that Adam, by his transgression, lost the image of God, brought sin and death into the world, involved the whole human race in all the miseries and consequences of sin,

and rendered them liable to *eternal ruin*.—And it is strenuously maintained that man has never emerged from that miserable state, and never has since possessed the image of God. But what does the Apostle Paul say of man some thousand years after this transgression? see 1 Cor. 11, 7. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he *is* (not *has been*) the *image* and *glory* of *God*." Will any pretend to say "God made us totally depraved?" O christian, lay not this charge to that holy Being "in whom we all live, move, and have our being," and "from whom cometh every *good*, and every *perfect* gift." Are we not all quickened by the breath of Jehovah? and does not all life emanate from him? Are we not all the "workmanship of his hand?" Is he not our Father, and has he not created the whole human race? O say not, then, that God created millions of human beings totally depraved, and in consequence of that depravity they are to be endlessly *miserable!* This would be casting a dreadful reflection on the character of God. It would be blasphemy! The sympathetic feelings of man, *depraved as he is*, revolt at the idea! No, christian reader, as long as the breast of man is the seat of one virtue, either social or moral, public or private—and as long as the heart expands with benevolence—swells with noble gratitude—glows with the tender feelings of love—dilates with the generous sentiments of friendship—breathes the sweet spirit of charity—sympathizes in the sufferings of the afflicted—melts at other's woes. and "weeps with those that weep," O call him not I beseech you totally depraved and worse than worthless!

Behold the inconsistency of this doctrine further exemplified. If man is *wholly depraved*, it follows of course, that *he can be of no value!* Look at this, and reconcile it. if you can with the *wisdom* of God in making the least exertion for the salvation of that which is totally worthless!—*did our Saviour bleed and die to redeem that which is of no value?*

The depravity of man is often urged, by the opposers of Universal Salvation, as an argument against that doctrine; but even if they could prove their doctrine of total depravity to be true, it would not, in the least, militate against the Salvation of *all* if any one could be saved: for all are alike depraved, and one remedy would equally apply to all. Therefore if mankind are *polluted*, *depraved*, and *contaminated*; so far as this *pollution* extends, thus far the healing power of a *Saviour* extends. Yes, blessed be the God of our Salvation, there is a skilful Physician of souls—a remedy for this terrible disease, who, with "healing in his wings" can save to the uttermost. The *power* and *love* of God are as illimitable as the universe, extensive as creation, and imperishable as eternity. Rejoice then, O christian, in the blissful anticipation of that glorious period, when the whole human race shall be "delivered from the bondage of sin and corruption." and enjoy that blissful immortality and eternal life, which our Saviour brought to light through the Gospel. And let us, brethren, anticipate the dawn of that happy era when "all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest,"—when "sighing and sorrow shall be done away," —"tears be wiped from off all faces," the "knowledge of Jehovah fill the whole earth as the waters fill the sea," and "God shall be ALL in ALL."

Finally whatever view we take of the doctrine of total depravity, it presents nothing but the most glaring absurdities. In short, it is contrary to reason, and scripture, derogatory to the character of God, and we think leads to all manner of licentiousness—It destroys all accountability to God; for surely God could not require any good actions from creatures who were totally depraved. Man could not be accountable for any action for it would be morally impossible for him to do any good; for "how can a corrupt fountain send forth pure water?" In short it does away all distinction between right and wrong in the moral and intellectual world, and destroys every incentive to *virtue & improvement*. But we hold to a different and more salutary doctrine. We hold that man, although created "*subject to vanity*, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope," is capable of doing much good, of improving the talents which God has given him, and of judging between *right* and *wrong*. We say man is an accountable being, and that every action he does is either *right* or *wrong*, and if an action is *right* it is *good* in the sight of the Lord.—We say that "there *is a reward* in *well doing*," and that "the way of the transgressor *is hard*." And we would hail the whole universe as a band of brothers; (however humiliating it would be to the Pharisee,) all having the same common Parent, the same Saviour, and all subject to the same infirmities, passions and frailties: For all mankind are fellow travellers together—human life is their journey, eternity their place of destination, and the "*Rock* of *Ages*" the foundation of their hopes of never ending felicity.

TIMOTHY.

FOR THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

OPPOSER OF TRUTH.

Nothing can be more foreign to my feelings than to expose the faults, or magnify the errors of mankind, certain circumstances however, render it necessary to record the real conduct of some men. Nothing deserves more severe reprehension than the illiberal spirit of many of our christian brethren. Their acts of illiberality, and persecution ought to be preserved for the consideration of future ages. A circumstance which manifests the spirit of the opposers of the truth, shows the state of the religious community and exhibits the decline of antichristian doctrine, occurred between myself and a Mr. Cook, a Presbyterian Clergyman, on the 29th, of Sept. last in the town of Warren, County of Herkimer, N, Y. Mr C. and myself through mistake, had an appointment to preach on the same day and at the same place. On the day appointed, a large congregation assembled. When I arrived, the people had collected, and were waiting my arrival. I was immediately informed of Mr. Cook's appointment and intention to preach. I asked to be introduced to Mr. C. which was effected. I expressed my regret that we should both have appointments at the same time and place, and proposed his occupying one half of the time. To this arrangement he readily agreed, and chose the morning for his exercises. I availed myself of the opportunity of hearing Mr. C. His subject was from Job 1st. 21, his remarks generally were appropriate and interesting. He spoke particularly of the subject of the sons of GOD presenting themselves before the LORD and of *Satan's* coming among them. He brought this subject down to the then, present time and improved it by a personal application. He said, "that GOD's dear children had assembled for the purpose of presenting themselves before the LORD," and asked "Has not *Satan* come also among you."? This question he answered himself by saying," *it is too true that he has come here for the purpose of disturbing your peacable worship.*" I availed myself of an opportunity, which presented after worship, to demand of Mr. C. an explanation and asked him if he did not allude to me when he said "*Satan had come also among them*" To this he answered "no." To whom then, Sir, did you allude.? "To the Rev. Hosea Ballou, the subject of Mr. Haynes sermon" said he. I expressed my utter astonishment at the answer, and the pleasure he manifested on recurring to that *disgraceful* and *wicked* production. I told him I was surprised at his giving such an irrational answer, and enquired if he had seen Mr. Ballou among the congregation while speaking, ? to this he would give no answer. Is a man influenced by the spirit of Jesus Christ who calls his fellow man a devil or the Devil's advocate? Are the opposers of truth necessitated to resort to such means to support their cause. ? Miserable indeed must be the cause that needs it ! In calling the Universalists the devil's preachers "they do as did the Pharisees of old, who called the master of the house Beelzibub" the Prince of devils. Can Universalists be called devils with any propriety ? The devil is a *destroyer*, if Universalists are *destroyers* and preach a destroying doctrine, they perhaps, justly deserve the appellation. But they are not destroyers neither do they preach endless destruction to mankind.

In the afternoon I was to deliver a discourse, a large number had seasonably assembled; among them was Mr. C. I named my subject and proceeded to an investigation of it. I had not proceeded far before Mr. C. arose and interrupted me by requesting me to "preach the *truth.*" I had been examining an opinion common in the christian church and a fundamental principle of the doctrine of endless misery. I was contrasting this with the doctrine of the scriptures of truth and adducing reasons for rejecting a sentiment full of partiality and cruelty. To this interruption, I paid no other attention than to pass it unnoticed; with this he was not to be satisfied. He soon made another attack, in an imperious tone and with a trepidation that manifested the awful convulsions of his mind, he demanded the names of the *authors* that espoused the opinions I was canvassing. I was astonished at this. To hear a gentleman of the most accomplished attainments and high literary fame virtually declare that the doctrine of the famous John Calvin was no longer *incorporated* in the creeds of the *Calvinistic* Church is calculated to excite the greatest surprise ! But why did Mr. C. deny the Calvinistic sentiment ? why did he wish to have it believed that Presbyterians were Armenians ? Because he knows he cannot make men of discernment swallow his Calvinistic doctrine, unless it be gilded with the plausible sentiment of Armenians, he knows that the doctrine of "election and reprobation" is so repugnant to humane feeling and benevolence, so inconsistent with the principles of reason and the providence of God, that he will endanger his "craft" if he preaches it in its purity. Mr. C's conduct was calculated to draw the attention of the whole congregation upon himself. To

see a man manifest *anger* because the opinions he cherishes are investigated, betrays a distrust of his own opinion, and shows that his cause is feeble and difficult to support. Mr. C. was informed that if any thing improper was expressed or insinuated against his particular sentiments, he could have the privilege of replying, if the people were disposed to hear him. This privilege he attempted to improve when my services were concluded. Contrary to his expectations, the people would not listen to him.—With one feeling they left the house. Many of them personally expressed to Mr. C. their dissatisfaction, while tacitly, yet plainly, they condemned his conduct and evinced a disposition to discountenance indecorum. With Mr. C. however, I had a personal interview after meeting, and gave him a fair opportunity to point out any errors in my discourse, as also to show any impropriety in my remarks upon the doctrines and traditions of the Elders. He did not attempt a justification of his conduct, nor expose the inconsistencies of the doctrine which he evidently wished to destroy.

The object of this communication is not so much to expose the errors of Mr. C. as to show the spirit of the doctrine, by which he undoubtedly was influenced. The reader is requested to find, if he can, a similarity between the fruits of Calvinism and those of the doctrine of Jesus. Calvinists say, you must not reason with others upon religious subjects. Christianity says, give "an answer to every man." Calvinism excludes all from the privileges of the gospel but those who will conform to the requirements of Synods &c. The religion of Jesus says, "love your neighbor as yourself," and "follow peace with all men."

The doctrine of Calvin says, "God predestined a certain few to be heirs of immortality and bliss and foreordained that a great part should be endlessly miserable, and all this without any foresight of faith or good works." The doctrine of Jesus says, "Christ came not to condemn (damn) the world, but to save the world." "That God will have all men (not a certain few) to be saved (not damned) and come to the knowledge of the truth!" That "every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear.—That "God is not willing, (much less determined) that any should perish, (be damned) but that all (not a few) shall come to repentance." That "all the ends of the world (not the favorite elect) shall (not may if they will) remember and turn (repent) unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations (not a few) shall worship before thee." Reader ponder these things, and the God of love assist your inquiries, and bless your labors with his grace.

GEORGE B. LISHER.

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, Feb'y. 22d. 1823.

MR. EDITOR,

Having read the Herald of Salvation with much pleasure, and feeling an ardent desire for the promotion of truth, I have taken the liberty to mention some of the errors and imperfections of this valuable publication.

The Universalists appear to lay exclusive claim to *orthodoxy*: it is true they do not assume that name; but the same spirit is discoverable in many of their publications. I would call your attention to Mr. Locke's very just remarks on orthodoxy, contained in the 5th No. of the Herald, and then request you to look over the Circular letter of the Northern Association, contained in the same number, and see if there is not something in the *spirit* of that production which bears a near resemblance to what Mr. L. calls *ridiculous*.

A want of charity and tenderness appears to me to be another barrier against the spread of this glorious doctrine: Those who say so much about having compassion on the ignorant and those that are out of the way, ought to teach by example as well as precept. The method of treating revivals of religion in your paper, appears not the most wise. It should be remembered that in these revivals error, noise and blind zeal are not all that have been observable; for I am fully convinced that much instruction has been communicated to young minds, which has laid the foundation for a life of virtue and piety. Should the Universalists be visited with an awakening, (which is greatly needed,) we cannot suppose that they would be led into all truth, and freed from all absurdities. We have been favored with very few communications of a practical nature, which have a most salutary effect on the minds and morals of community.

Many columns of the Herald have been taken up in republishing dedications, encomiums on architects, chandeliers, &c.—which appear to me to be incompatible with the design of this work.

Be assured sir, that these remarks have been dictated by the most sincere friendship for you, and with an ardent desire that your editorial labors may be extensively useful to mankind.

AN OBSERVER.

REMARKS.

We trust we shall ever be as happy to receive reproof, as to give it—to have our errors corrected, as to correct those of others; especially when performed in the spirit of christian charity, which evidently characterizes the above communication. We say "Let the righteous smite us; it shall be a *kindness;* and let him reprove us; it shall be an *excellent oil.*"

But if we should be able to point out more *incorrectness* in the above production, than "Observer" has in the particulars to which he refers; we trust our labor will not be in vain—and we hope it will be favorably received.

1. "Observer" seems to think that Universalists claim *orthodoxy*, and cherish the spirit of *orthodoxy*.

If the term orthodoxy be taken in its proper sense, which is—right opinion, or sound in doctrine; then it will follow, that every man who has an opinion, is orthodox in his own mind! But when we so far pervert the use of the word orthodoxy, as to make it synonymous with popularity; when we associate with it a bitter domineering and relentless spirit which would deprive others of their equal rights and enforce its pretended authority, by fire and sword, on pain of damnation—and all this under the supposed sanction of a God of *Wrath;* if any Universalist should cherish the spirit of this kind of orthodoxy, he would disgrace his profession—he must virtually abandon his faith.

"Observer" requests our attention to Mr. Locke's remarks on orthodoxy contained in our 5th, No. and then refers to the Circular contained in the same No. to find what Mr. L. calls "ridiculous."

By reference to Mr. L's. remarks it will be seen that he does not think it "ridiculous" for people to suppose their own opinions true, but he censures them for claiming infallibility and "erecting to themselves a power to censure and condemn others for differing at all from the tenets they have pitched upon."

We have carefully examined the Circular to which reference is made, and we see no claim to infallibility—no censuring or condemning others—nor any thing "ridiculous." The writer of that Circular expresses his conviction of the truth and his assurance of its final triumph—he says explicitly, *We must love our enemies.*" Surely this is very far from what Mr. L. calls "ridiculous."

2. "Observer" thinks there is "a want of charity and tenderness" among Universalists. It is possible that this may sometimes be the case; but no instance has been given, excepting the one we have just answered. We admit that Universalists should, teach by example as well as by precept; and we sincerely hope no one will neglect this excellent admonition.

3. "Observer" says "The method of treating revivals of religion in your paper appears not the most wise," he then proceeds to state, that in these revivals "instruction has been communicated which has laid the foundation for a life of piety and virtue."

Here our "Observer" appears not to have observed very attentively—for we are persuaded that a careful perusal of our 1st. and 4th, Nos. where revivals are mentioned—that instruction "which lays the foundation of a life of piety and virtue" is most earnestly recommended: it is the pernicious practice of sanctioning ignorance, delirium, illiberality, party spirit and bigotry that we strenuously oppose—but we wish to do every thing in our power to promote "a life of virtue and piety."

Greatly as Universalists need *reformation*. (a term we prefer instead of the word *awakening*, for we think Universalists are not all *asleep*,) and constantly liable as is human nature to imperfections; we wish to guard against *absurdities*, especially that of making great pretensions to sanctity, while in our daily walk we do no better than others.

4. "Observer" remarks that we have been favored with very few communications of a practical nature" &c.

We admit that it is far more important to induce mankind to follow the precepts of Christ, than to attach themselves to any *party*, merely for the sake of opposing others—we are fully persuaded that to teach and enforce supreme *love* to God, the Father of mercies—and *love*, unfeigned, universal *love* to mankind as brethren of one family—produces a most powerful, practical influence upon community—an influence incomparably more salutary—than the dreadful practice of grounding a hypocritical character on the slavish fear of an eternal hell in an invisible state.

5. "Observer" says "Many columns of the Herald have been taken up in republishing Dedications" &c. Now this is entirely a mistake. Instead of "many columns" being thus occupied, not so many as 2 columns out of 80 have been thus occupied. This he thinks is "incompatible with the design of this work." We think such accounts compatible with that article which promises our readers religious intelligence—the prosperity of a society is easily un-

derstood by the *dimensions* of their house for public worship &c.

Believing that we have examined "Observer's" production with the most perfect amity, we shall take our leave of him by assuring him that his testimony of friendly *feeling* is most affectionately reciprocated.

For the Herald.

"UNION PRAYFR MEETINGS" No. 2.

Mr. Editor,

In a former number, I attempted to delineate the character of the "Union Prayer Meetings," in reference to their *exclusion* of several religious sects: I now beg leave, through your paper, to notice them in another point of view. The author of the piece on these meetings, in the "Christian Almanack," after stating, "that they are composed of those several denominations, who believe in the *supreme divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ*," adds—"*the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit.*"—— This was evidently intended to convey the idea, that there were denominations who do not believe in the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. That this was intended, will, I presume, be admitted by all without hesitation. For if this be not the meaning, why is it proposed as a criterion of admission into the privileges of those meetings? The question now arises, what denominations could be intended? To this query, the answer is obvious, those denominations that *disbelieve* the supreme divinity of Christ. For the professors who *believe* in his supreme Divinity, are admitted by the first clause of the criterion of admission.—The plain amount of this particular requirement is—that the writer supposed none but Trinitarians believe in "the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit."

In this he was incorrect, and it is also believed, that there is not a sect of professing christians in the United States which denies the necessity of regeneration. And if this be the fact, to insinuate that there are, is an imposition on that part of the public, which has not the means, or the inclination to derive correct information on the subject.—And that insinuation could only originate in *bigotry* or *ignorance*. In either case, the writer justly merits reprehension. For if he were ignorant, it must appear proper for him to have sought, and to have obtained a suitable knowledge of facts, prior to venturing before the public. But if he was not ignorant—if he knew that it was an indirect misrepresentation, what apology can be offered for his conduct? But one—he only published, what others had planned, and organized, and acted upon for some time;—while the world saw not the ligaments that bound so many in new and strange union, and had therefore, only gazed and wondered at the phenomenon. Admitting then, the correctness of this almanack maker's statement, that 160.000 persons would read his work; still it may be fairly presumed, that while part will imbibe incorrect notions, with respect to the religious opinions of their neighbors; others will be extricated from the toils of religious domination, by learning that all christians believe in "the necessity of regeneration."—It is by no means necessary, that men believe the *personality* of the Holy Spirit, in order to suppose it the *efficient* in the work of regeneration. The Holy Spirit is properly the *Spirit of Truth:* and hence Jesus says it shall "guide you into all truth." Hence to receive "the truth in the love of it," is to receive the Holy Spirit's influence. And this sentiment may, and often does produce every characteristic of regeneration, that is visible in those who hold the personality of the Spirit. If then, the tree is known by its fruit, and the same fruit is produced in those who believe, and those who disbelieve the Trinity; then we infer, that it is produced by the same cause, and that both are *regenerated* by the Holy Spirit. In respect to regeneration, it is now proper to observe, that there are partial differences of opinion, *not with regard to its necessity;* but concerning its nature and the time of its operation.—Some sects suppose its process entirely miraculous; and that its operations must be felt or experienced, in this state of existence. Others believe and agree, that the period of miracles has passed away—that though miracles may again be wrought before the close of the gospel plan; yet we are not to expect they will be continued under the features they bore at Penticost, or be applied to conversion, as in the apostle Paul. Most of this class suppose, that as our Saviour, did not specify the time necessary for the new-birth, man has no authority to fix the precise period when he "must be born again." The rest of those who deny miraculous regeneration, believe the exertion of renewing power will be felt, at or before death. Those who deny the aid of miracles in regeneration, suppose the work to consist in producing faith, reconciliation, and conversion from sin to virtue and holiness, by the teaching of the Holy Spirit in the application of *truth* revealed in the scriptures—the oracles of God.

MARCUS.

POETRY.

SILENT WORSHIP.

Tho' glorious, O God! must thy temple have been,
On the day of its first dedication,
When the cherubim's wings widely waving were seen,
On high o'er the ark's holy station.

When even the chosen of Levi, though skill'd
To minister, standing before thee,
Retir'd from the cloud which the temple then fill'd,
And the glory made Israel adore thee.

Though awfully grand was thy majesty then;
Yet the worship thy gospel discloses,
Less splendid in pomp to the vision of men,
Far surpasses the ritual of Moses;

And by whom was that ritual forever repealed?
But by him unto whom it was given
To enter the oracle where is revealed,
Not the cloud, but the brightness of heaven.

Who, having once entered hath shown us the way,
O Lord! how to worship before thee;
Not with shadowy forms of that earlier day,
But in *spirit* and *truth* to adore thee!

This, this is the worship the Saviour made known,
When she, of Samaria, found him,
By the Patriarch's well, sitting weary, alone,
With the stillness of noon-tide around him.

How sublime, yet how simple, the homage he taught,
To her, who enquired by that fountain,
If JEHOVAH at Solyma's shrine would be sought?
Or ador'd on *Samaria's* mountain?

Woman! believe me, the hour is near,
When he, if ye rightly would hail him,
Will neither be worshipped *exclusively* here,
Nor yet at the alter of Salem.

For God is a spirit! and they, who aright
Would perform the pure worship he loveth,
In the heart's holy temple will seek, with delight,
The spirit the Father approveth.

And many the prophecy's truth can declare,
Whose bosoms have livingly known it,
Whom God hath instructed to worship him there,
And convinced that his mercy will own it.

The temple that Solomon built to his name,
Now lives but in history's story,
Extinguish'd long since, is its altar's bright flame,
And vanquished each glympse of its glory.

But the christian made wise, by the wisdom divine,
Tho' all human fabrics may faulter,
Still finds in his heart a far holier shrine,
Where the fire burns unquench'd on the alter.

SELECTED.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

Our heavenly Father; hallowed Name,
Obey'd in Heaven; by earth the same,
Give us our food—our sins remit
Freely; as thus we others treat.
Restrain when flesh would lead to sin,
Save us from ills, without, within,
For more is thine than we can pen,
All worlds, pow'rs, glories, times; Amen.

The following letter was taken from a manuscript in the possession of the present family of Kelly, now in Lord Kelly's Library, which was taken from the original letter of Plebius Lentulus, at Rome.

A CHRISTIAN.

Letter of Plebius Lentulus to the Senate of Rome, concerning Jesus Christ.

It being the usual custom of Roman Governors to advertise the senate and people of such things as happen in their provinces, in the day of the emperor Tiberius Cæsar, Plebius Lentulus, president of Judea, wrote the following epistle to the senate, concerning our Saviour.

"There appeared in these our days a man of great virtue, named JESUS CHRIST, who is yet living among us, and of the gentiles is accepted for a prophet of truth, but his own disciples call him the Son of God—he raiseth the dead, and cureth all manner of diseases. A man of stature somewhat tall and comely, with very reverend countenance, such as the beholders both love and fear—his hair of the colour of a chesnut full ripe, plain to his ears, whence downward it is more orient, curling and waving about his shoulders. In the midst of his head is a seam, or partition of his hair, after the manner of the Nazarites—His forehead plain and very delicate—His face without spot or wrinkle, beautified with a lovely red—His nose and mouth so formed, as nothing can be reprehended—His beard thickish, in color like his hair, not very long, but forked—His look innocent and mature—His eyes grey, clear and quick. In reproving he is terrible—In admonishing, courteous and fair spoken—pleasant in conversation, mixed with gravity. It cannot be remembered that any have seen him laugh—but many have seen him weep. In proportion of body most excellent—His hands and arms most delectable to behold. In speaking very temperate, modest and wise. A man, for his singular beauty, surpassing the children of men.

PLEBIUS LENTULUS.

MARRIED.

In Watertown on the 4th inst. by the Rev. P. Morse, MR. WILLIAM MCCARTY, of Scipio, Cayuga Co. to MISS LAURA DELANO, daughter of Capt. Thomas Delano, of the former place.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE,

*****
****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.